



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,738	12/04/2001	Jon R. Stieber	180009.91206B	8278
26710	7590	10/04/2003	EXAMINER	
QUARLES & BRADY LLP 411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 2040 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497				BARTUSKA, FRANCIS JOHN
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				3627

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/004,738	STIEBER ET AL.
	Examiner F. J. BARTUSKA	Art Unit 3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2001.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1, 2, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Hasegawa et al. Hasegawa et al disclose a plurality of game machines 1 that receive and dispense coins, a token dispenser 4 that dispenses tokens, a collecting cart 5 that receives and

counts coins and tokens and a management computer 3 that monitors cash handling all communicating by a wireless network.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al in view of PCT publication WO 00/56105. Hasegawa et al disclose all the features of the applicants' claimed invention except the connection to a network. The PCT publication discloses a similar network of cash handling machines, see page 12, lines 26-30, that is connected to the Internet or another network, see page 4, lines 21-36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the showing and teaching of the PCT publication to connect the system of Hasegawa et al to a network such as a bank network.

6. Claims 5-7, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al in view of Richardson et al. Hasegawa et al disclose all the features of the applicants' claimed invention except the Bluetooth technology. Richardson et al discloses a wireless communications network that uses Bluetooth technology with frequency hopping beginning at 2402 MHz with each of 79 hops being 1 MHz above the next lower frequency, see col. 3, line 58 to col. 4, line 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of

the showing and teaching of Richardson et al to substitute Bluetooth technology for the wireless communication network of Hasegawa et al.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al in view of Richardson et al. Hasegawa et al disclose all the features of the applicants' claimed invention except the Infrared technology. Richardson et al discloses a wireless communications network that uses Infrared technology with IrDA standards, see col. 3, lines 4-17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the showing and teaching of Richardson et al to substitute Infrared technology for the wireless communication network of Hasegawa et al.

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al in view of Erekson. Hasegawa et al disclose all the features of the applicants' claimed invention except the piconet technology. Erekson discloses a wireless communications network that uses Bluetooth technology with the devices connected in a piconet, see col. 5, lines 5-37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the showing and teaching of Erekson to substitute

Bluetooth technology including a piconet for the wireless communication network of Hasegawa et al.

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wang is cited for the disclosure of the Bluetooth technology in col. 19, line 51. Mothwurf is cited for the disclosure of the Bluetooth technology in col. 14, lines 7-27.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. J. BARTUSKA whose telephone number is 703-308-1111. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-FRIDAY (ALTERNATE FRIDAYS OFF).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI can be reached on 703-308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

fjb

  
F. J. BARTUSKA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
9/27/03